IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 9078 of 1998

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.R. SHAH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

SAURABH PARK IPCL EMPLOYEES CO OPERTIVE HOUSING SOCIETY

Versus

DISTRICT REGISTRAR

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 9078 of 1998

MR SHIRISH JOSHI for Petitioner No. 1-11

MR BS PATEL for Respondent No. 1,3-7

MRS RANJAN B PATEL for Respondent No. 1-7

RULE SERVED for Respondent No. 2

Mr. Dipen Desai, AGP for Respondent No. 8

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE M.R. SHAH

Date of decision: 13/10/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

In this petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India the petitioners had challenged the legality and validity of the order dated 2nd July 1997

passed by the District Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Vadodara, as well as order dated 16th February 1998 passed by the State Government in Revision Application by which the District Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Vadodara, passed an order of appointment of Administrator. While admitting the present Special Civil Application, the ad-interim relief granted earlier was vacated by this Court and therefore there was no stay order and the order passed by the District Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Vadodara, dated 2nd July 1997 was implemented.

2. Today when the matter is called out it is reported that even the term of the petitioners is already over during the pendency of the present Special Civil Application as the petitioners were elected on 30th July 1998. In that view of the matter, nothing further is required to be done by this Court as the petition has become infructuous by afflux of time. The petition is disposed of as having become infructuous. Rule is discharged.

rmr. [M.R. Shah, J.]